

REMARKS

Claims 1, 4-9, and 11-13 were considered and rejected in Final Office Action dated June 21, 2005 as being obvious over cited prior art.<sup>1</sup> An amendment (Amendment B) was filed in response to the Final Office Action. However, Amendment B was not entered, as indicated in the Advisory Action dated October 21, 2005. Amendment C is now being filed for consideration with an RCE.

By this paper, claims 1 and 9 have been amended and new claims 15-16 have been added, such that claims 1, 4-9, and 11-16 remain pending. Claims 1, 9 and 12 are the only independent claims at issue.<sup>2</sup>

As reflected in the claims listing above, the claims are generally directed to embodiments in which information stored at an information server is accessed and made retrievable using the Internet, wherein the location of the information is specified by address data stored at an address server which is connected to the Internet, and wherein the address data is associated with an identifier in the address server. The method recited in claim 1, for example, includes transmitting an identifier in a message from the address server to a mobile station using a short message based service. The mobile station retrieves the identifier from the message and uses it as an argument to a URL designating the address server. The address server then provides the information to the mobile station after receiving the information from an information server, and wherein the address server access the information through the information server by using the address data that the address server associates with the identifier that was received as an argument to the URL designating the address server.

The embodiment recited in claim 9 generally corresponds to the method recited in claim 1, except that claim 9 is a server system type claim that corresponds to the address server recited in claim 1. The only other independent claim at issue, claim 12, is a device type claim corresponding to the mobile station recited in claim 1.

In the Final Office Action, the claims were rejected in view of a combination of T'so and

---

<sup>1</sup> The Office Action rejected claims 1, 4-9, and 11-13 under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,047,327 to T'so et al. in view of U.S. Patent Application No. 2001/0032254 by Hawkins.

<sup>2</sup> The amendments made to the independent claims and the new claims are supported by the disclosure in the specification, including, but not limited to the disclosure found on pages 9, 11 and 12.

**BEST AVAILABLE COPY**

Hawkins. This combination of references was required because it was acknowledged that "Tso does not explicitly disclose using the identifier as an argument to the URL when accessing the address server. Tso also does not explicitly disclose using said address data associated with the identifier at said address server to access said information server over the internet..." as generally claimed. (see Page 3 of the Office Action).

To compensate for the failings of Tso, the Office Action relies on Hawkins. However, for at

**BEST AVAILABLE COPY**

**BEST AVAILABLE COPY**